UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,572	10/30/2000	Nikolai Grigoriev	25310-1B	8706

21123   7590   04/21/2004

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/699,572	GRIGORIEV, NIKOLAI
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Rachna Singh	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 October 2000</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2, 10/30/00</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This application is responsive to communications: Application filed 10/30/00.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3.   The claims are objected to because the claims 8 and 15 do not start on a

separate line and are on the same lines as claims 7 and 14 respectively, thus, making

reading and entry of claims/amendments difficult. Substitute claims with lines one and

one-half or double spaced on good quality paper are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao

et al., US 5,883,635, 3/16/99 (filed 11/15/96).

In reference to claim 1, Rao teaches producing a single-image view of a multi-

image table using graphical representations of the table data. Rao teaches the

following:

-Receiving a table having comprised of rows and columns. See column 1, lines 50-67.

The intersection of the row and column is a cell. The information in the table reaching

portions beyond a single cell because of the large amount of information. See column

2. The cells of the table arranged in a plurality of rows and columns. See column 7,

lines 38-55. Compare to *"receiving a table having one or more cells wherein each cell spans one or more columns and one or more rows"*.

-Representing a table in an n-dimensional array data structure where the positional relationship of data arrange by rows and columns conveys information about the data. . See column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6. Compare to *"representing the table as a geometric grid wherein one or more positions within the grid house one or more of the cells."*

-Receiving an image display request from a user interaction device. The request including a request for an operation and information identifying the requested operation. The processor receiving the request configured to access the data store in memory and the instruction indicating instructions for the operating system. Displaying the table in a virtual screen or presentation space for a window. See columns 28-29. Compare to *"providing a generic table represented by one or more formatting commands operable to provide a rendering of the grid to one or more output media'*.

Rao does not state the use of "formatting commands to provide a rendering of the grid"; however, he does teach receiving an image display request in which the user request can comprise of any number of actions the user considers necessary for indicating a valid request and causing an operation to be performed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a "formatting command" as Rao teaches that the user can request certain actions to indicate some sort of operation be performed on the data as would a formatting command. See columns 28-29.

In reference to claim 2, Rao teaches representing a table in an n-dimensional array data structure where the positional relationship of data arrange by rows and columns conveys information about the data. See column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6.

In reference to claim 3, Rao teaches displaying the table in a virtual screen or presentation space for a window or to the area for printing or facsimile transmission. See columns 28-29.

In reference to claims 5-6, Rao teaches representing the table in an n-dimensional array data structure which could be a rectangle or two-dimensional array.

In reference to claim 7, Rao does not state the use of "formatting commands to provide a rendering of the grid"; however, he does teach receiving an image display request in which the user request can comprise of any number of actions the user considers necessary for indicating a valid request and causing an operation to be performed.

Claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above. An n-dimensional array is a matrix. See above.

In reference to claims 9-10 and 14, Rao teaches receiving an image display request from a user interaction device. The request including a request for an operation and information identifying the requested operation. The processor receiving the request configured to access the data store in memory and the instruction indicating instructions for the operating system. Displaying the table in a virtual screen or presentation space for a window. See columns 28-29. Rao further teaches does teach receiving an image display request in which the user request can comprise of any

number of actions the user considers necessary for indicating a valid request and

causing an operation to be performed (i.e. processing vertically, in parallel).

In reference to claim 11, Rao teaches representing a table in an n-dimensional

array data structure where the positional relationship of data arrange by rows and

columns conveys information about the data. See column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6.

In reference to claims 12-13, Rao teaches receiving an image display request

from a user interaction device. The request including a request for an operation and

information identifying the requested operation. The processor receiving the request

configured to access the data store in memory and the instruction indicating instructions

for the operating system. Displaying the table in a virtual screen or presentation space

for a window. See columns 28-29. Rao further teaches does teach receiving an image

display request in which the user request can comprise of any number of actions the

user considers necessary for indicating a valid request and causing an operation to be

performed, such as configuring the output or adjusting dimensions.

Claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale in claim 1 above in view of the fact

that Rao teaches receiving an image display request from a user interaction device.

The request including a request for an operation and information identifying the

requested operation. The processor receiving the request configured to access the

data store in memory and the instruction indicating instructions for the operating system.

Displaying the table in a virtual screen or presentation space for a window. See

columns 28-29. Rao further teaches does teach receiving an image display request in

which the user request can comprise of any number of actions the user considers

necessary for indicating a valid request and causing an operation to be performed (i.e. processing vertically, in parallel). See rejection for claim 1 above.

In reference to claims 4 and 18, Rao does not teach that the table or first format is in XSL. However, XSL data can comprise a table, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the table be in a XSL format as XSL was a well-known format for representing style and content of data at the time of the invention.

Claims 16-17 and 19 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 7, 2, and 3 respectively above.

In reference to claim 20, Rao teaches representing a table in an n-dimensional array data structure where the positional relationship of data arrange by rows and columns conveys information about the data. See column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6. Thus the data structure has different dimensions than the table.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,613,099	Crim
US 6,292,809	Edelman
US 6,415,305	Agrawal et al.
US 2002/0069221	Rao et al.
US 6,694,487	Iisar
US 6,661,919	Nicholson et al.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 703.305.9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RS
4/15/04

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER